



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/202,464	03/09/1999	KOHSUKE KINO	06501/024001	2927
7590	02/11/2005		EXAMINER	
JANIS K FRASER FISH & RICHARDSON 225 FRANKLIN STREET BOSTON, MA 021102804				HUYNH, PHUONG N
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1644

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/202,464	KINO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuong Huynh	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE Three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,5,29-35 and 38-47 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1, 5, 29-35, 38-40, and 43-44 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 41,42,45 and 46 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 47 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 5, 29-35 and 38-47 are pending.
2. In view of the amendment filed 1/6/05, the following rejections remain.
3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
4. Claims 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling only for peptides and composition comprising said peptides (claims 1, 5, 29-35, 39-40, and 45-47) and methods of treating and diagnosing pollinosis (claims 43-44), **does not** reasonably provide enablement for a method for “preventing” pollinosis as set forth in claim 41-42 using any peptide mentioned above. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required to practice the claimed invention are summarized *In re Wands* (858 F2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). The factors most relevant to this rejection are the scope of the claim, the amount of direction or guidance provided, the lack of sufficient working examples, the unpredictability in the art and the amount of experimentation required to enable one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention. The specification disclosure is insufficient to enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention as broadly claimed without an undue amount of experimentation.

The specification discloses only the specific peptides as set forth in claims 1 and 39 for a method of treating pollinosis and diagnosis of pollinosis by determining T cell proliferation in response to said peptides.

The specification does not teach how to “*prevent*” pollinosis by administering any peptide such as the ones recited in claims 1 and 39 or any analog peptide because there is insufficient *in vivo* working example demonstrating that the claimed method can prevent pollinosis. The term “*preventing*” is problematic because the term “*prevent*” as define by the

Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary, of record, as "to keep from happening or to anticipate or counter in advance". The specification fails to provide guidance as how to select or identify an individual before allergy symptoms begin, how to predict who would or would not get allergy, let alone "preventing" allergy from happening.

For these reasons, it would require undue experimentation of one skilled in the art to practice the claimed invention. See page 1338, footnote 7 of *Ex parte Aggarwal*, 23 USPQ2d 1334 (PTO Bd. Pat App. & Inter. 1992).

In re wands, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988), the decision of the court indicates that the more unpredictable the area is, the more specific enablement is necessary. In view of the quantity of experimentation necessary, the limited working examples, the unpredictability of the art, the lack of sufficient guidance in the specification and the breadth of the claims, it would take an undue amount of experimentation for one skilled in the art to practice the claimed invention.

Given the absence of a rebuttal to the outstanding rejection set forth above in applicant's amendment, filed 1/6/05 the rejection is maintained for the reasons of record.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office Action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO94/01560 publication (of record, Jan 1994; PTO 1449).

The WO 94/01560 publication teaches an analog peptide consisting of GATRDRPLWIIFSGNMMNIKL which is analog peptide of the claimed sequence GATRERSLWIIFSKNLNIKL of SEQ ID NO: 9 (see reference peptide CJI-7, Fig 13, in particular). The reference peptide has more than one amino acid substitutions and stimulates a T cell proliferation (See bold letter above and claims 119-120 of WO 94/01560 publication, in particular). Since the reference analog peptide appears to be the same as the claimed analog peptide, the reference analog peptide inherently produces interferon gamma equal to or greater than the wild-type peptide, especially the reference peptide is use for reducing the symptoms of Japanese cypress pollinosis or cedar pollinosis (See claims 64 and 68 of WO 94/01560, in

particular). Since the Patent Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing the antibodies of the instant invention to those of the prior art, the burden is on applicant to show that the prior art antibody is different from the claimed antibody. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430(CCPA 1977). Thus, the reference teachings anticipate the claimed invention.

Given the absence of a rebuttal to the outstanding rejection set forth above in applicant's amendment, filed 1/6/05 the rejection is maintained for the reasons of record.

7. Claims 1, 5, 29-35, 38-40, and 43-44 are allowed.
8. Claim 47 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong Huynh "NEON" whose telephone number is (571) 272-0846. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:00 am to 5:30 p.m. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (571) 272-0841. The IFW official Fax number is (571) 273-8300.

11. Any information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phuong N. Huynh, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600
February 4, 2005

Christina Chan
CHRISTINA CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600